



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/627,896	07/27/2000	Man Sung Co	GNN-5315DV1	2462		
25291 7	590 02/26/2002					
AMERICAN HOME PRODUCTS CORPORATION FIVE GIRALDA FARMS PATENT LAW			EXAMINER			
			GAMBEL, PHILLIP			
MADISON, N.	J 07940		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1644	10		
			DATE MAILED: 02/26/2002	10		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATE EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

FIRST NAMED APPLICANT

ATTY. DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER

	· ·				VRT UNIT	PAPE	RNUMBER
			•	1	644	10	0
			•	DATE &	AILED:	26/0	າ2,
					4	Zer	<i></i>
	This is a communication from the examiner in char COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMAR		: .				• . •
		OFFICE ACTION SU	WWARY				
E	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	12/31/01					
	This action is FINAL.			-			
	Since this application is in condition for allow accordance with the practice under Ex parte	vance except for formal matte Quayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 453	ers, prosecutio O.G. 213.	on as to the	merits is	closed in	
w th	shortened statutory period for response to this hichever is longer, from the mailing date of this e application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C 136(a).	communication. Failure to p	espond within to may be obtain	month he paried for hed under the	response	will cause	: R ,
Di	sposition of Claims						
. [Claim(s)			is/a	re pendin	g in the ap	plication.
_	Of the above, claim(s)			is/are w	vithdrawn		-
	Claim(s) 1- 4	-			!	s/are allow	
F	Claim(s)					s/are rejec re objecte	•
Ē	Claim(s)			bject to restr		•	
Ą	pplication Papers		* '				
A	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Pa	atent Drawing Review. PTO-	948				
A 	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Pa The drawing(s) filed on	<u> </u>		to by the Exa	, aminer.		
A	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Pa The drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on		948. is/are objected	to by the Exa		disap _l	proved.
<u> </u>	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Particle drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.				disap	proved.
	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Exami The oath or declaration is objected to by the	iner.				disap	proved.
	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Particle drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.				disap _l	proved.
	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Exami The oath or declaration is objected to by the	iner. Examiner.	is/are objected			☐ disap	proved.
	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Exami The oath or declaration is objected to by the priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	iner. Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	is/are objected	is 🔲 a		☐ disap _l	proved.
	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Examing The oath or declaration is objected to by the priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreity and None of the CER received.	iner. Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	is/are objected	is 🔲 a		☐ disap _l	proved,
	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Examing The oath or declaration is objected to by the priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreity and Sorne* None	iner. Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C. (TIFIED copies of the priority	is/are objected	is ☐ a		☐ disapı	proved.
	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on	iner. Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C. (TIFIED copies of the priority	is/are objected	is ☐ a		☐ disap	proved.
	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Examing The oath or declaration is objected to by the priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreity and a claim for foreity in the control of the CER received. The received in Application No. (Series Code received in this national stage application of the control of the cereity in this national stage application.)	iner. Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C. ITIFIED copies of the priority e/Serial Number) on from the International Bur	§ 119(a)-(d). documents have	is ☐ a		☐ disapı	proved.
C	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on	iner. Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C. ITIFIED copies of the priority e/Serial Number) on from the International Bur	§ 119(a)-(d). documents have	is ☐ a		☐ disap	proved.
C	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on The proposed drawing correction, filed on The specification is objected to by the Examination The oath or declaration is objected to by the priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreity and a claim for foreity the property of the CER received received in Application No. (Series Code received in this national stage application *Certified copies not received: Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestication of the claim for domestic the description of the claim for domestic t	iner. Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C. ITIFIED copies of the priority e/Serial Number) on from the International Bur	§ 119(a)-(d). documents have	is ☐ a		☐ disap	proved.
C	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on	iner, Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C. (TIFIED copies of the priority e/Serial Number) on from the International Burnestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d). documents have	is ☐ a		☐ disap	proved.
C	See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Part The drawing(s) filed on	iner, Examiner. ign priority under 35 U.S.C. (TIFIED copies of the priority e/Serial Number) on from the International Burnestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d). documents have	is ☐ a		☐ disap	proved.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-4) as it reads on transplantation with traverse in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged. In the interest of compact prosecution, the election of transplantation will be considered a

Therefore, applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-4), as it reads on transplantation is considered an species election, as submitted by applicant.

Claim 5 has been withdrawn from consideration by the examiner 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to election without traverse.

2. The application is required to be reviewed and all spelling, TRADEMARKS, and like errors corrected. nonelected invention and/or species

Trademarks should be capitalized or accompanied by the ™ or ® symbol wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the trademarks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

3. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-3 are indefinite in its recitation of "modulating" and "treating" because it is ambiguous as to the nature, direction (positive or negative) or degree of said "modulating" or "treating".

Applicant is invited to limit the claims to "inhibiting" as it reads on the elected invention and to clearly defined the nature of the claimed methods (e.g. endpoint).

The applicant is reminded that the amendment must point to a basis in the specification so as not to

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the add any new matter. See MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06 rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Freeman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,316) (see entire document). Freeman et al. teach the use of B7-2-specific antibodies, including recombinant antibodies thereof (columns 25-28), in order to cause immunosuppression or induce tolerance, including their use to inhibit transplant rejection in various modalities (columns 28-32). In addition, Freeman et al. Teach the use of inhibitory B7-2-specific antibodies in combination with other immunosuppressive reagents (columns 28-32). Applicant is reminded that no more of the reference is required than that it sets forth the substance of the invention. The claimed functional limitations and constructions encompassed by the claims would be inherent properties of the referenced methods to inhibit transplant rejection with B7-2-specific recombinant antibodies.
- 7. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by de Boer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,346,248) (see entire document). De Boer et al. teach the use of B7-2-specific immunotoxins, including recombinant antibodies thereof (columns 7, paragraphs 7 to column 8, paragraph 1 and columns 14-18), in order to cause immunosuppression, including their use to inhibit transplant rejection in various modalities (column 8, paragraph 10 to column 11, line 8 and column 19, paragraph 4 to column 20, paragraph 7). Applicant is reminded that no more of the reference is required than that it sets forth the substance of the invention. The claimed functional limitations and constructions encompassed by the claims would be inherent properties of the referenced methods to inhibit transplant rejection with B7-2-specific recombinant antibodies.
- 8. No claim is allowed.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip Gambel whose telephone number is (703) 308-3997. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center telephone number is (703) 305-3014.

PHILLIP GAMBEL

Phillip Gambel, Ph.D. Primary Examiner Technology Center 1600 February 25, 2002